Remarks

Claims 17-30, 47, 51-53, 55-56, 58-59, and 61-63 were rejected as unpatentable over JEYARAMAN 6,377,957 in view of BENSON et al. 6,202,085. Independent claims 17, 47, and 61-63 have been amended and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Support for the amendment is found on page 16, lines 11-22, with further support at page 18, lines 11-15, page 19, lines 21-23, and page 32, line 24 to page 33, line 2.

Neither JEYARAMAN nor BENSON et al. discloses that an update object is a minimum element of the structured document as defined in the amended claims. As defined herein, the updated minimum element has a minimum node tree structure including an updated portion of the structured document and is determined by referring to its transfer object flag that is at the tag node at the top of the node tree structure.

That is, the updated minimum element is the transfer object having a tree structure and a tag node as its top and that has the transfer object flag, which is thus immediately higher than the updated node. Accordingly, the claims emphasize that the minimum element is a minimum tree-structured set of nodes including an updated node as a child node so that processing at the receiving side includes only the replacement of data, which allows the receiving side device to have a lower processing capability. While the terms “immediately higher” and “child” do

not appear explicitly in the disclosure, one of skill in the art will recognize that the claimed subject matter and support for these comments is expressed in the above-noted portions of the disclosure.

In JEYARAMAN (column 2, lines 14-15, column 5, lines 55-62), an update is constructed by combining update data and operation instructions (e.g., insert, delete, move, etc.) so that a more complex operation is required, such as reconstructing the structured document. The receiving side device must have a higher processing capability than afforded by the present invention.

By way of example, suppose that a first child node is deleted from tree-structured nodes under a parent node and a second child node is added to the tree-structured nodes under the parent node. In JEYARAMAN, a transfer object has to be constructed by using identification data of the first child node and the second child node accompanied with the operations “delete” and “add” respectively. At the receiving device, both deletion of the first child node and addition of the second child node have to be performed, which requires complicated operations and increases the work load on the receiving device. By contrast, in the device claimed herein, a transfer object is constructed by an updated minimum element which an updated tree-structured set of nodes in which the child node is already deleted and the second child node is already added. At the

receiving device, only replacement of the tree-structured nodes with the updated tree-structure nodes is performed, which is a much simpler operation than in JEYARAMAN.

BENSON et al. do not make up for this shortcoming and thus the claims avoid the rejection under §103.

The dependent claims are allowable for similar reasons.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Thomas W. Perkins/

Thomas W. Perkins, Reg. No. 33,027
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

TWP/lrs